DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 655 SP 014 239

AUTHOR Stapleton, James C.
TITLE Teacher Brinkmanship and Job Satisfaction.
PUB DATE 10 Apr 79
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Factor Analysis; *Job Satisfaction; Maladjustment; Measurement Instruments; *Power Structure; Role Theory; Statistical Studies; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Alienation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Brinkmanship

ABSTRACT

Since acts of teacher brirkmanship were considered to represent an expression of the teachers' dissatisfaction with the teachers' role, it was conjectured in this study that a relationship should exist between teachers' attitudes toward teacher brinkmanship and the teachers' job satisfaction. Two instruments, the Teacher Job Satisfaction Inventory and the Teacher Brinkmanship Inventory, were administered to 296 teachers and the results were intercorrelated. Analysis of the various factors and scenarios presented in the inventories and the intercorrelation showed that attitudes toward acts of teacher brinkmanship are related to the teachers' job satisfaction derived primarily from the principal. Acts of teacher brinkmanship are not isolated acts related to nothing, and principals might do well to interpret such acts as functional and deal with them accordingly. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171655

16.13

TEACHER BRINKMANSHIP AND JOB SATISFACTION

James C. Stapleton

Spring (TX) Independent School District

John C. Croft

University of Houston

April 10, 1979

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between teacher's attitudes toward acts of teacher brinkmanship and teacher's job satisfaction. Through the use of canonical corrlation, a significant relationship was found to exist. The nature of the relationship indicates that school administrators should develop an understanding of teacher brinkmanship.

Presented in a Symposium on Brinkmanship in Schools, The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Division A, San Francisco, California.

SP014239

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John C. Croft

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER BRINKMANSHIP AND TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION

The school is a complex social system. This complexity perhaps requires teachers to exhibit a variety of behaviors that may be related to the roles they are expected to fulfill as members of the social system. Some behaviors may represent an effort to express dissatisfaction with the teachers' role, particularly the teachers' role in the subordinate-superordinate relationship. For example, Corwin interviewed 143 randomly selected teachers and found that almost half of the conflicts with which the teachers were involved also involved the administration of the school.[1] Additionally, Clear and Seager reported that teachers' zones of acceptance -- a range of acceptability to directives issued by superiors -- was consistently less than administrators' zones of desired influence.[2] Therefore it seems reasonable to assume that many teachers are dissatisfied with their role in the subordinate-superordinate relationship.

Although the expression of this dissatisfaction may take many forms, one possible mode of expression has been defined by Goffman as role distance behavior.[3] Goffman states that role distance behavior refers to actions which effectively convey some disdainful detachment of the performer from a role he is performing. The subordinate who exhibits role distance behavior is often careful not to threaten those who are in charge of the situation, he may just inject some expression to show, for any who

care to see, that he is not capitulating completely to the work arrangement in which he finds himself.

Licata and Willower, employing Goffman's reasoning concerning role distance behavior, describe this type of expressive behavior, when it is directed toward the authority system of the school, as brinkmanship behavior.[4] Following Licata and Willower, the term teacher brinkmanship is used to refer to teacher behavior which attempts to challenge the authority system of the school while avoiding its negative sanctions. For the most part, brinkmanship acts are improvisational and satirical in nature. Brinkmanship acts are usually disguised in some manner (humor being a common disguise), and ordinarily take place in front of an audience.

Additionally, Licata and Willower have categorized acts of brinkmanship as subversive-obedience, tight-roping, and boundary-testing.[5] Subversive-obedience is rule obeying behavior. However, the subversive-obedient teacher complies with regulations to the letter or in an exaggerated way in order to use the organization's rules and regulations to its own disadvantage. The subversive-obedient teacher is quick to point out that he did not react to the disturbance in the lunch room because he was told to monitor the hall. Tight-roping is neither rule obeying nor rule disobeying behavior. It is behavior which is difficult to define and uses vagueness as a means of avoiding sanctions. The teacher who is a master of satire in the teachers' lounge would characterize this type of behavior. Boundary-testing is rule disobeying behavior and will result in negative sanctions being bestowed upon the actor unless he disguises his act in some manner. This type of brinkmanship behavior

would be characterized by the teacher who does not perform a certain duty when the prinicpal is away from the building.

Since acts of teacher brinkmanship were considered to represent an expression of the teachers' dissatisfaction with the teachers' role, it was conjectured that a relationship should exist between teachers' attitudes toward teacher brinkmanship and the teachers' job satisfaction. Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to address two questions regarding brinkmanship behaviors. First, is there a systematic relationship between teacher attitudes toward teacher brinkmanship behavior and teacher job satisfaction? Second, what is the nature of the relationship?

Method

Measuring Job Satisfaction

For reasons that perhaps relate to the conventional belief that good teachers are dedicated teachers and those that are not dedicated are not good, studies of teacher job satisfaction are relitively few.[6] Therefore, using the the work of Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman as the theoretical foundation, the development of an instrument to measure teacher job satisfaction was undertaken.[7] Herzberg and his colleagues developed the theory that a set of intrinsic factors are mainly responsible for job satisfaction, and a set of extrinsic factors are mainly responsible for job dissatisfaction. Therefore, the two categories of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction form the basis for the development of the insturment.

Items were written for the Teacher Job Satisfaction Inventory (TJSI) to represent the five intrinsic dimensions of achievement, responsibility,

work-itself, recognition, and advancement. Items were also written to represent the seven extrinsic dimensions of co-workers, supervision-technical, supervision-human relations, salary, security, working conditions, and school policies and practices. Dunnette, Campbell, and Haskel developed thirty-six items representing the above aspects.[8] Twelve additional items were composed such that each of the twelve dimensions were represented by four items. Each item was worded so respondents could indicate their degree of satisfaction with it. Response alternatives ranged from very satisfactory, satisfactory, neither satisfactory or unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, to very unsatisfactory.

The instrument was first administered to 168 graduate students in the college of education at a major urban university. First- and second-order factor analysis of data from this preliminary study seemed to indicate the intrinsic-extrinsic measurement capabilities of the instrument. After the preliminary study the instrument, along with the instrument for measuring attitudes toward brinkmanship behavior, was printed in booklet form and mailed to 1479 elementary and secondary teachers in the state of Texas. Three hundred fifty-seven booklets were returned; 296 were in usable form and included in the study. The subjects represented 127 different elementary and secondary schools.

In order to characterize the structure of the domain of teacher job satisfaction, data from these subjects were subjected to first- and second-order factor analysis using principal components extraction procedures. Two second-order factors were obtained from this procedure. Interpretation of second-order factors was based on the relationship

of the original forty-eight items to the two second-order factors. The matrix of pattern coefficients indicating this relationship is produced by post multiplying the first-order matrix of pattern coefficients by the matrix of the second-order pattern coefficients. The expression utilized to produce this product matrix, first presented by Cattell, is as follows:

$$P_{vh} = P_{vf} P_{fh}$$

(where h is used to denote the number of second order factors, v is the number of variables, and f is the number of first-order factors).[9]

Although several solutions were produced, a varimax rotation of the product matrix produced from the multiplication of a Harris-Kaiser type II first-order matrix and a varimax second-order matrix was selected as the most interpretable.[10] The two factors obtained are presented in tables 1 and 2, in which the twenty-five items with the highest pattern coefficients on each factor are displayed.

Factor one, particularly the first ten items, contains items related to intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction. Specifically, the extrinsic items concern the superior. Unless items related to one's superior are reconsidered and placed in the intrinsic factor space, this factor must be considered as a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic sources of satisfaction. Although this interpretation of factor one seems reasonable, further examination reveals several interesting relationships.

To begin, factor one, contains only five extrinsic items (four of which possess the lowest pattern coefficients of the twenty-five items

TABLE 1

FACTOR ONE ON TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY

Item	Pattern Coefficient
29. Your superior's understanding of you	.656
30. Amount of challenging duties	.620
41. Your superior's willingness to listen to suggestions	.606
28. Opportunities you are given to participate in the running of the school	.603
16. Amount of responsibility you are given	.591
39. Your superior's managerial ability	.589
27. The competence of your superior	.587
40. Opportunity to help in policy making	.581
15. Administrative ability of your superior	.578
3. The supervision and guidance given you by your superior	.577
26. Sense of achievement in work	.574
38. Feelings of worth while accomplishment in work	.574
14. Being able to complete a difficult assignment	.570
46. Procedures used in making teaching assignments	.559
13. Your personal relations with colleagues	.558
8. Praise for the work you do	.551
42. Opportunities to use aptitudes and abilities	.551
17. Your superior's willingness to back you up	.547
4. Being responsible for your own efforts	.541
25. Respect you are given by colleagues	.536
10. Communication of school policies	.528
44. Recognition your work group receives	.526
36. Provision of equipment and supplies	.520
20. Amount of recognition you receive	.517
22. Well defined personnel policies	.501

presented) that are not related to the superior. Additionally, no items are contained in the factor that represent the salary and security components of extrinsic satisfaction. Therefore, it appears that subjects who completed this instrument did not differentiate the intrinsic components of satisfaction associated with their job from their perceptions of confidence which the superior invests in the subordinate. In other

words, the intrinsic sources of satisfaction are tied to the superior and his willingness to allow the teacher to receive intrinsic satisfaction. For example, the superior's understanding of the teacher (first item on factor one), determines or is connected to the amount of challenging duties the teacher performs (second item on factor one).

TABLE 2

FACTOR TWO ON TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY

Item	Pattern Coefficient
31. Prospects for future earnings	.771
19. Salary compared to other occupations	.748
43. Salary compared to hours worked	.737
7. Salary	.702
35. Opportunities for promotion	.632
21. Prospects for comfortable retirement	.622
23. Opportunities for advancement	.614
47. Opportunities to advance professionally	.577
11. Progress toward a promotion	.571
20. Amount of recognition you receive	.540
44. Recognition your work group receives	.519
8. Praise for the work you do	.462
40. Opportunity to help in policy making	.458
48. Provision of ancillary staff (secretaries and aides)	.429
41. Your superior's willingness to listen to suggestions	.424
9. Security in your job	.410
46. Procedures used in making teaching assignments	.406
17. Your superior's willingness to back you up	.403
22. Well defined personnel policies	.401
29. Your superior's understanding of you	.401
12. Working conditions (heating, lighting, air-conditioning, etc.)	.394
27. The competence of your superior	.387
39. Your superior's managerial ability	.386
15. Administrative ability of your superior	.383
42. Opportunities to use aptitudes and abilities	.368

Because of these considerations, a lack of extrinsic items other than those related to the superior, the presence of intrinsic items with high pattern coefficients, and the complete absence of the salary and security components of extrinsic satisfaction, factor one is named Intrinsic Satisfaction with Influence of Superior.

Factor two, presented in table 2, is clearly extrinsic and contains few inconsistencies with the original development of extrinsic satisfaction, other than the lack of items related to the superior. Several items concern salary, promotion, retirement, and the like. Therefore, factor two is named Extrinsic Satisfaction.

Measuring Attitudes Toward Teacher Brinkmanship

A review of the literature did not reveal an instrument capable of measuring teachers' attitudes concerning teacher brinkmanship behavior. Therefore, the development of an instrument was deemed essential.

In order to measure teacher attitudes about teacher brinkmanship behavior, several scenarios depicting various types of brinkmanship behavior were produced. These scenarios were developed from data provided by approximately twenty teachers in each of two separate school districts. The forty teachers were presented definitions of the three types of brinkmanship behavior: subversive-obedience, tight-roping, and boundary-testing. The teachers were asked to write down experiences which they actually observed, or knew of happening, in school that seemed to be best classified according to each of the definitions. From these original scenarios, four were selected to represent each of the three types of teacher brinkmanship behavior.

Using the twelve scenarios as concepts, the preliminary form of the Teacher Brinkmanship Inventory (PTBI) was developed employing a variation of the semantic differential technique developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum to assess semantic meaning.[11] The 168 subjects in the preliminary study rated each scenario on each of 18 semantic differential adjective-scales. The pooled within-scenario correlation matrix was computed and reduced in rank using principal components procedure followed by rotation to the varimax criterion.[12] Based upon this preliminary factor analytic study, four adjective pairs were choosen to measure each of the factors, "evaluation," "potency," and "activity," which Osgood et al. have suggested underlie semantic meaning. These scales are presented in table 3.

TABLE 3

SCALES DEFINING FACTORS ON
TEACHER BRINKMANSHIP INVENTORY

Evaluation	Potency	Activity
Pleasant-Unpleasant	Thick-Thin	Fast-Slow
Happy-Sad	Heavy-Light	Active-Passive
Fair-Unfair	Deep-Shallow	Sharp-Dull
Wide-Narrow	Hot-Cold	Busy-Idle

In order to select the most suitable scenarios representing the three types of brinkmanship behavior, it was assumed that scenarios accounting for the most variance would be the most suitable. Thus, least squares regression estimates of factor scores were calculated for each of

the three factors. The scenarios for which the scores were summarized by factor means and confidence intervals most extreme positive and negative were choosen. The following represent the six scenarios used in the Teacher Brinkmanship Inventory (TBI).

Subversive-obedience behavior was depicted by the following two scenarios.

(1)The principal was confronted by an angry parent when her child received a failing grade. The parent was not aware that her child was failing. The principal asked the department chairman if he told this particular teacher to send a progress report home before giving a final grade. The department chairman, who is a teacher, said that he had not because, according to the policy manual, that is the principal's responsibility.

(2)The principal frequently makes announcements in a somewhat authoritarian manner. Mr. Green, a teacher, when in the teacher's lounge, stands at attention, salutes the public address speaker, and says "Heil Hitler," after the principal's announcements.

Tight-roping behavior was depicted by the following two scenarios.

(1)After signing an approval for band students to be released from classes for a practice, the principal received a request for allowing ten students to be released from their last period classes so they could participate in a spelling bee. The principal immediately turned down the request, asking the teacher to meet with those ten at noon. The teacher agreed to do so but commented to the principal that if you were a band director you

could pull one-hundred kids out of class, but if you are a classroom teacher you can work before school, at noon, or after school.

(2)Following the expulsion of three students for carrying alcoholic beverages on a field trip and the suspension of a student for stealing money from the P.E. dressing rooms a teacher commented to the principal that he thought the principal's values were a little "out-of-whack" when drinking becomes a worse offense than stealing.

Boundary-testing behavior was depicted by the following two scenarios.

(1)Schedule changes necessitated a shift of classes and the principal informed a teacher that she would be affected and would have four preparations instead of her previous three. He said they looked at the situation and could not find another solution and she said, "Well, either take another look or find another science teacher because I have no intention of doing four preparations, especially when some teachers have only two now."

(2)Although Mr.Graig rarely leaves school early, he never gets the principal's prior approval as the principal has requested his teachers to do.

The TBI was administered to the same collection of teachers as was the TJSI (296 teachers representing 127 different elemenatary and secondary schools). First-order factor analysis of data provided by these teachers again substantiated the existence of Osgood's et al. three factors of "evaluation," "potency," and "activity."[13] Additionally, consistency in structure of attitudes with the preliminary study was obtained. Again, as

in the preliminary study, the pooled within-scenario correlation matrix of the twelve bipolar scales was calculated and subjected to factor analysis. As in the preliminary study the transformed solution produced by the varimax rotation was considered to be the most desirable. The pattern coefficients of all three factors for all items are contained in table 4.

TABLE 4

PATTERN COEFFICIENTS OF ITEMS DEFINING FACTORS OBTAINED FROM WITHIN SCENARIO CORRELATION MATRIX OF BIPOLAR SCALES IN THE TEACHER BRINKMANSHIP INVENTORY

Item	Factor One Activity	Factor Two Evaluation	Factor Three Potency
Fair-Unfair	.223	.568	.359
Thick-Thin	.372	.116	.545
Active-Passive	.728	-.002	.134
Pleasant-Unpleasant	.086	.831	.169
Light-Heavy	-.195	.670	-.346
Fast-Slow	.769	.127	.010
Happy-Sad	.169	.796	.017
Shallow-Deep	-.128	.025	-.834
Sharp-Dull	.744	.122	.230
Wide-Narrow	.246	.481	.488
Hot-Cold	.726	.074	.181
Busy-Idle	.719	.095	.300

The pattern coefficients for the twelve scales depicted in table 4 clearly depict the three factors of "activity," "evaluation," and "potency." In fact, the factors are almost identical to those obtained in the preliminary study, pointing to the stability of attitudes measured by these scales characterizing teacher brinkmanship.

Determining Existence of Relationship

The two factors obtained from factor analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Inventory, representing the domains of job satisfaction, along with scores on each of the three factors contained in the Teacher Brinkmanship Inventory, representing the domains of teacher attitude toward teacher brinkmanship, were intercorrelated. This produced a 20 X 20 correlation matrix which was subjected to the technique of canonical correlation: two measures of job satisfaction versus 18 measures of attitudes toward teacher brinkmanship behavior.[14] Canonical correlation was considered to be an appropriate technique since the focus of this study was to determine the existence and nature of the relationship between two classes of variables: two independent variables representing job satisfaction and 18 dependent variables representing attitudes toward teacher brinkmanship behavior.

Results

The canonical correlation between the domain of job satisfaction and the domain of attitudes toward teacher brinkmanship was found to be .3681. Wilks lambda was calculated to be .802, for which $\chi^2 = 63.15$, df = 36, and $p < .003$. The canonical weights, that linear combination of standardized measures of brinkmanship attitude which produced the canonical variate x, are listed in the upper portion of table 5. Contained in the lower portion of table 5 are the canonical weights, that linear combination of the standardized measures of job satisfaction which produced the corresponding canonical variate y, spanning the satisfaction domain. No other pair of canonical variates can be defined possessing a

a greater degree of linear correlation. Moreover, no subsequent pairs of canonical variates were found. Hence, whatever relation exists between the two domains of teacher attitude toward brinkmanship and teacher job satisfaction is summarized in this pair of canonical variates.

Nature of Relationship

Interpretation of each variate, x and y, is best based upon the structure coefficients rather than the canonical weights. The structure coefficients for variate x are in the upper portion of table 5. In the lower portion of table 5, the structure coefficients for variate y are listed. Additionally, another type of linear correlation between an original variable in one domain with the canonical variate spanning the opposite domain has been suggested by Frankiewicz and Merrifield.[15] These values, the canonical index, are also listed in table 5.

The structure coefficients for variate y indicate that the variable A, intrinsic with influence of superior, is more highly related to variate y than variable B. Therefore, canonical variate y, given the canonical weights listed in table 5, seems almost exclusively to have variance shared with the intrinsic with influence of superior variable. The squared structure coefficients of this variable (.874) is almost nine times greater than the squared structure coefficient for the extrinsic variable (.126), and indicates that the intrinsic with influence of superior variable contributes more to defining variate y.

As previously stated, the intrinsic with influence of superior variable might be interpreted as relating to how the teacher feels about his job because of what he is allowed to do, because of his superior's

TABLE 5

CANONICAL VARIATE PAIR X AND Y, SPANNING THE EIGHTEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHER BRINKMANSHIP BEHAVIOR AND TWO JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLES

Scenario	Behavior Type	Factory	Variable	Canonical Weight	Structure Coefficient	Canonical Index
	1. Tight-Roping	Activity	TBI1	-.27680	-.333	-.123
I	2. Tight-Roping	Evaluation	TBI2	.01770	.094	.034
	3. Tight-Roping	Potency	TBI3	-.22089	-.001	-.000
	4. Subversive-Obed.	Activity	TBI4	.16447	-.007	-.003
II	5. Subversive-Obed.	Evaluation	TBI5	.04091	.044	.016
	6. Subversive-Obed.	Potency	TBI6	.00751	.192	.071
	7. Boundary-Testing	Acitvity	TBI7	.08210	-.158	-.058
III	8. Boundary-Testing	Evaluation	TBI8	-.36037	-.081	-.030
	9. Boundary-Testing	Potency	TBI9	.21345	.103	.038
	10. Tight-Roping	Acitvity	TBI10	-.19772	-.233	-.086
IV	11. Tight-Roping	Evaluation	TBI11	.30349	.400	.147
	12. Tight-Roping	Potency	TBI12	.23521	.204	.075
	13. Subversive-Obed.	Acitvity	TBI13	-.05676	-.139	-.051
V	14. Subversive-Obed.	Evaluation	TBI14	.73098	.738	.272
	15. Subversive-Obed.	Potency	TBI15	.09065	.116	.043
	16. Boundary-Testing	Acitvity	TBI16	.05901	-.102	-.004
VI	17. Boundary-Testing	Evaluation	TBI17	.21845	.300	.110
	18. Boundary-Testing	Potency	TBI18	-.13425	-.000	-.000
	A. Intrinsic with Influence of Superior			.93495	.935	.344
	B. Extrinsic			.35526	.355	.131

style, inclinations, and personality. Since this variable concerns the understanding, sensitivity, back-up, opportunities, and responsibilities afforded the subordinate, variate y must be interpreted in much the same manner. Although some of the items defining this variable, and this canonical variate, are clearly intrinsic in nature, they were all perhaps related to the superior. Accordingly, the amount of responsibility one was given was due, in part, to the unique personality of the superior; the opportunities to participate in the running of the school were present or absent because of the superior and his understanding of the subordinate.

This interpretation of canonical variate y leads to a definition that is rather subjective, personal, and definitely related to the superior. Perhaps this variate represents the subordinate's evaluation of the superior. However, the judgments concerning the superior seem to be of a rather personal nature, a rating of the superior as a person rather than a manager.

An examination of the structure coefficients computed for variate x, presented in the upper portion of table 5, reveals four variables that have correlations that are significantly different from zero with the underlying canonical variate. These variables represent four different scenarios. Three of the variables (variables TBI11, TBI14, and TBI17) concern the evaluative factor; one variable (TBI1), concerns the activity factor.

Variable TBI1 is the activity factor on the first scenario, a teacher's reaction to the principal expelling students for drinking and imposing a lighter punishment for students caught stealing. The teacher told the principal that his values were "out-of-whack."

TBI11 is the evaluation factor on scenario IV. Scenario IV concerns a judgment the principal made whereby he allowed band students to be released from classes but not students in academic classes. Variable TBI14 is the evaluation factor on scenario V. This scenario depicts an authoritarian principal and a teacher's reaction to the principal's announcement by implying the principal is Adolf Hitler. TBI17 is the evaluation factor on scenario VI. Scenario VI describes a teacher leaving school early but without the permission of the principal who wants his teachers to get his permission.

By contrasting these scenarios with the two (scenario II and III) that did not have variables with correlations significantly different from zero, a clearer description of variate x is perhaps possible. Scenario II concerns the principal questioning a teacher about sending progress reports home. Scenario III concerns the principal informing a teacher that schedule changes would affect the teacher. Both of these scenarios concern procedures that imply the principal was not making a judgment about the issue. In other words, the principal was not exposing himself either by his action or by his judgments. His values and personality were removed from the situation; he was merely checking on or actualizing set procedures. Therefore, the teahcers' reactions were aimed at the situation rather than the principal.

The other four scenarios describe a rather different setting. In each of these scenarios, the prinicpal was exposing some aspect of himself. Some judgment was made or action was taken on the part of the principal that precipitated the teacher's action. Moreover, these scenarios depict

situations whereby the principal had a choice in what he did. Teachers may have preceived these situations as being the result of the principal and he alone. In other words, the situation arose because the principal's values were different from the teacher's. Perhaps the teachers perceived the principal as valuing drinking more than stealing, band more than spelling, his directives more than teacher's feelings, and his own time schedule more than the teacher's time schedule. Therefore, perhaps variate x is best described as the teacher's evaluation of acts of brinkmanship resulting from superior caused situations. Also, the situations are seen as being caused by the principal, not because of his postion, but because of his mannerisms, personality, and values.

If these interpretations of x and y are tenable, one could infer that acts of teacher brinkmanship will arise most often from situations which reflect, what the teacher considers to be, the principal's poor judgment or distorted values. Consequently, the teachers' evaluation of the principal (variate y), is maximally related to acts of teacher brinkmanship in situations which reflect the principal's values (variate x).

These four variables in variate x (TBI1, TBI11, TBI14, and TBI17) also possess the highest canonical index values. Also, the canonical index for the intrinsic with influence of superior variable in variate y is again greater than the extrinsic variable contained in this variate.

Both the structure coefficients and canonical index values for variable TBI14 are greatest in magnitude of those variables in variate x. This variable is the evaluation factor on scenario V, the authoritarian principal demanding that a teacher come to his office, and the coefficient

and index values support the above argument. This scenario exposes the principal as insensitive to the feelings of his teachers, it states that the principal is authoritarian, and the situation depicted was caused by the principal because of his "distorted values." Thus, its relation to variate y may be expected to be greatest if variate y represents the teachers' satisfaction partially in presence of his perception of the principal and the kind of person he is.

Discussion

Attitudes toward acts of teacher brinkmanship are related to the teachers' job satisfaction derived primarily from the principal. However, how should the principal react to an attitude and, in fact, an act of teacher brinkmanship? Certainly, a principal cannot allow a teacher to challenge his every action, or brink after every encounter. But just as certainly, a principal who recognizes the purposes of brinking should not react to every brinkmanship act. Such a procedure would create an endless cycle whereby each action creates the need for a reaction.

The results of this study indicate that acts of teacher brinkmanship are not isolated acts related to nothing. Since acts of teacher brinkmanship are related to the teachers' job satisfaction, a principal might do well to interpret such acts as functional. After all, a principal must give orders and teachers will, at times, become dissatisfied with even the very best principal. Perhaps, if not performed to insalubrious degree, teachers should be allowed to brink without receiving the furious rage of the principal. If, on the other hand, a majority of teachers are continually brinking, perhaps the principal should examine the personal relationships between himself and his teachers.

NOTES

1. Ronald G. Corwin, Professional Persons in Public Organizations, in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, eds, F. C. Carver and T. J. Sergiovanni. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969).

2. D. K. Clear and R. C. Seager, "The Legitimacy of Administrative Influence as Perceived by Selected Groups," Educational Administration Quarterly 7 (1971).

3. Eving Goffman, Encounters (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merril Company, 1961).

4. Joseph W. Licata and Donald J. Willower, "Student Brinkmanship and the School as a Social System," Educational Administration Quarterly 11 (1975).

5. Ibid.

6. P. G. Koopman-Boyden and P. G. Adams, "Role Consensus and Teacher Job Satisfaction," The Journal of Educational Administration 12 (1974): 98-113.

7. F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959).

8. M. D. Dunnette, J. P. Campbell, and M. D. Hakel, Factors for Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction, in Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics, eds. J. P. Robinson, R. Athanasiou, and K. B. Head. (Institute of Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1973).

9. R. B. Cattel, "Higher Factor Structures and Reticular vs. Hierarchical Formulae for their Interpretation," Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1 (1966).

10. These rotations were first presented in C. W. Harris and H. F. Kaiser, "Oblique Factor Analytic Solutions by Orthogonal Transformations," Psychometrika, 45 (1964); H. F. Kaiser, "The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis," Psychometrika, 23 (1958).

11. C. E. Osgood, G. J. Suci, and P. G. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

12. H. F. Kaiser, "The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis," Psychometrika, 23 (1958).

13. C. E. Osgood, G. J. Suci, and P. G. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

14. H. Hotelling, "Relations Between Sets of Variables," Biometrika 28 (1936).

15. R. G. Frankiewicz and P. R. Merrifield, "A Comparison of Multiple Regression and Canonical Correlation Results," 3 September 1967. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association (Division 5) Washington, D. C.